2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	RAOUL D. KENNEDY (Bar No. 40892) DAVID W. HANSEN (Bar No. 196958) JAMES P. SCHAEFER (Bar No. 250417) SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLO. 525 University Avenue Palo Alto, California 94301-1908 Telephone: (650) 470-4500 Facsimile: (650) 470-4570 Raoul.Kennedy@skadden.com David.Hansen@skadden.com James.Schaefer@skadden.com MICHAEL H. MENITOVE (pro hac vice pending SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLO. Four Times Square New York, New York 10036 Telephone: (212) 735-3000 Facsimile: (212) 735-2000 Michael.Menitove@skadden.com Attorneys for Defendant,	g)
12	SANDISK CORPORATION	
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
14	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
15	OAKLAND DIVISION	
16	ALFRED T. GIULIANO, Chapter 7 Trustee of the Ritz Estate, on Behalf of the Ritz Estate;	CASE NO. CV 10-02787-SBA
	CPM Electronics Inc.; E.S.E. Electronics, Inc., and MFLASH, Inc.	[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
18		
19	On Behalf of Themselves and All Others Similarly Situated,	EXCLUDE THE REPORT AND TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT DR. RYAN SULLIVAN
		TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
20	Similarly Situated,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
20 21	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
20 21 22	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, V.	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
20 21 22 23	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. SANDISK CORPORATION,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
20 21 22 23 24	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. SANDISK CORPORATION,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. SANDISK CORPORATION,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'
220 221 222 223 224 225	Similarly Situated, Plaintiffs, v. SANDISK CORPORATION,	TESTIMONY OF PLAINTIFFS'

Case4:10-cv-02787-SBA Document260 Filed10/22/14 Page2 of 2

1	Defendant SanDisk Corporation ("SanDisk") has filed this Motion to Exclude the Report		
2	and Testimony of Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Ryan Sullivan pursuant to Rule 702 of the Federal Rules of		
3	Evidence and Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993).		
4	Dr. Sullivan's opinions related to market power and market concentration are contrary to		
5	law and, therefore, should be excluded as unreliable and unhelpful to the trier of fact. See, e.g.,		
6	Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co., No. 11-CV-01846-LHK, 2012 WL 2571332, at *6 (N.D. Cal.		
7	June 30, 2012); Bailey v. Allgas, Inc., 148 F. Supp. 2d 1222, 1245-46 (N.D. Ala. 2000), aff'd, 284		
8	F.3d 1237 (11th Cir. 2002). In addition, his opinions are inadmissible because they are based on		
9	evidence relating to the wrong product market. See Champagne Metals v. Ken-Mac Metals, Inc.,		
10	458 F.3d 1073, 1079 (10th Cir. 2006).		
11	With regard to impact and damages, Dr. Sullivan's opinions are excluded because his		
12	regression model is "so incomplete as to be inadmissible as irrelevant." See Freeland v. AT & T		
13	Corp., 238 F.R.D. 130, 147 (S.D.N.Y. 2006) (quoting Bazemore v. Friday, 478 U.S. 385, 400 n.10		
14	(1986)). In addition, Dr. Sullivan's opinions are unreliable because they are based on unsupported		
15	assumptions, see McGlinchy v. Shell Chem. Co., 845 F.2d 802, 807-08 (9th Cir. 1998), and also do		
16	not fit the facts of the case because those assumptions are contrary to market realities. See Concord		
17	Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp., 207 F.3d 1039, 1057 (8th Cir. 2000).		
18	For the reasons stated above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:		
19	Defendant's Motion to Exclude the Report and Testimony of Plaintiffs' Expert Dr. Ryan		
20	Sullivan is GRANTED.		
21			
22	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
23			
24	SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG		
25	United States District Judge		
26			
27			
28			
	1		